DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 197 029 UD 021 156

AUTHOR Iwanicki, Edward F.; Gable, Robert K.
TITLE 1979-1980 Hartford Project Concern Program. Final Evaluation Report 80-20.
INSTITUTION Hartford Public Schools, Conn.
PUB DATE Sep 80
NOTE 122p.; Report prepared by the Evaluation Office. For related documents see ED 177 516 and UD 020 970-971.

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC05 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Academic Achievement; *Career Choice; *Desegregation Methods; Elementary Secondary Education; Program Evaluation; Racial Integration; School Desegregation; School Holding Power; *Student Attitudes; *Student Attrition; Suburbs; Urban Schools; Voluntary Desegregation
IDENTIFIERS Connecticut (Hartford); Elementary Secondary Education Act Title I

ABSTRACT

The Project Concern Program, which sought to promote school desegregation through cooperation among schools in Hartford, Connecticut, and its suburbs, is evaluated in this report. The evaluation addresses the following areas: (1) career patterns of project graduates, dropouts, and non-participants in Hartford; (2) issues of attrition; and (3) the project's cognitive and affective impact on students. Survey data indicated that Project Concern graduates made higher occupational choices and became involved in post secondary education at a greater rate than other groups. Results of a survey of second through eighth graders suggested that students had positive attitudes toward themselves and school. Academic achievement data was incomplete. The program attrition rate was 8.2 percent with most students leaving for disciplinary and social reasons. Evaluative data are included in tables and appendices. (MK)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED197029

FINAL EVALUATION REPORT 80-20

1979-1980 HARTFORD

PROJECT CONCERN PROGRAM

Conducted by

Edward F. Iwanicki
Robert K. Gable

Evaluation Consultants
University of Connecticut

Presented to the

Hartford Public Schools

September, 1980

UD021156

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
Herman La Fontaine
Hartford Public Schools
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The 1979-80 evaluation of the Hartford Project Concern Program would not have been possible without the full cooperation of the participating communities. Our sincere thanks are extended to the superintendents, principals, and teachers in the Project Concern communities for their support and assistance.

In addition, we wish to express our gratitude to particular individuals whose efforts were crucial to the conduct of the evaluation:

To Patrick Proctor of the Connecticut State Department of Education for his support and interest that a quality program evaluation be conducted.

To Robert Nearine, William Paradis, Mary Carroll, Nancy Berson of the Hartford Public Schools for their inputs into the design of the evaluation, their assistance in coordinating the testing activities, and their cooperation in providing access to information regarding Project Concern participants.

To Robert Pitocco and Regina Brown of the Hartford Public Schools for their assistance in gathering career pattern data regarding Project Concern Dropouts and Hartford Non-Participants.

To Donald Thompson of the University of Connecticut for his consultation regarding the career pattern aspect of the evaluation.

To Hartford Test Specialists for the professional manner in which they conducted the administration of the Metropolitan Achievement Tests.

To Susan Stout for her assistance in checking and key-punching the evaluation data.

To Ann Marie Fortier for her secretarial assistance, often in light of some difficult time constraints.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

		Page
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS		ii
LIST OF TABLES		iv
LIST OF APPENDICES		vi
CHAPTER		
I	INTRODUCTION AND EVALUATION DESIGN	
	Introduction	1
	Development of the Design for the 1979-1980 Project Concern Evaluation	3
	Analyzing the Career Patterns of Project Concern Graduates, Dropouts, and Hartford Students	4
	Examining Attrition from Project Concern	4
	Monitoring the Cognitive and Affective Impact of Project Concern	5
	Summary	8
II	EXAMINATION OF THE CAREER PATTERNS OF PROJECT CONCERN GRADUATES, DROPOUTS, AND HARTFORD NON-PARTICIPANTS	
	Background	11
	Research Design and Data Analysis	11
	Results	13
	Conclusions	21
III	EXAMINATION OF THE ISSUE OF ATTRITION FROM PROJECT CONCERN	
	Design and Implementation of the Attrition Study.	24
	Treatment of the Data	25
	Results of the Attrition Study	25
	Summary	31
IV	MONITORING THE COGNITIVE AND AFFECTIVE IMPACT OF PROJECT CONCERN	
	Monitoring Cognitive Impact	33
	Monitoring Affective Impact	45
V	SUMMARY	
	Examining the Career Patterns of Project Concern Graduates, Dropouts, and Hartford Students.	52
	Examining Attrition From Project Concern	54
	Monitoring the Cognitive and Affective Impact of Project Concern	54

LIST OF TABLES

Table		Page
1	A Summary By Grade of the Levels and Form of the Metropolitan Achievement Test Used to Monitor the Performance of Project Concern Participants As Well As the Areas Tested	9
2	Survey Return Rates for Graduates, Dropouts and Non-Participants	14
3	Career Pattern Analysis for Non-Participants, Project Concern Dropouts, and Project Concern Graduates by Percent	17
4	Response by Percent to Survey Items by Group	20
5	Frequency of Students Leaving Project Concern by Reason and Grade Level	26
6	Reasons for 55 Student Transfers to the Hartford Public Schools and Associated Student Frequencies	28
7	Summary of the Number and Percent of Project Concern Students Served and Tested by Program Component and Grade Level	35
8	Summary by Grade Level of Mean Metropolitan Achievement Test Standard Score Performance In All Test Areas for Project Concern Students In the Suburban School Component	37
9	Summary by Grade Level of Mean Metropolitan Achievement Test Standard Score Performance In All Test Areas for Project Concern Students In the Non-Public School Component	38
10	Summary by Grade Level of Mean Metropolitan Achievement Test Standard Score Performance In All Test Areas for Project Concern Students In the Inner-City School Component	39
11	Summary by Grade Level of Mean Metropolitan Achievement Test Performance In Major Skill Areas for Project Concern Students In the Suburban School Component	42

Table		Page
12	Summary by Grade Level of Mean Metropolitan Achievement Test Performance In Major Skill Areas for Project Concern Students In the Non-Public School Component	43
13	Summary by Grade Level of Mean Metropolitan Achievement Test Performance In Major Skill Areas for Project Concern Students In the Inner-City School Component	44
14	Percent and Frequency of "True" Responses On the Student Survey by Grade Level for Students Participating In the Suburban and Non-Public Schools Components of the Project Concern Program	47
15	Percent and Frequency of "True" Responses On the Student Survey by Grade Level for Students Participating In the In-City Schools Component of the Project Concern Program	48
16	Percent and Frequency of "True" Responses On the Student Survey for Students Participating In All Components of the Project Concern Program	49

LIST OF APPENDICES

Appendix		Page
A	Follow-up of Graduates	57
B	Examples of Various Occupations from the North-Hatte Occupational Prestige Scale and Their Relative Ranking from 1-10	59
C	Examples of the Three Types of Career Patterns	60
D	Project Concern Student Attrition Form	61
E	Project Concern Student Evaluation Form	63
F	Compensatory Project Evaluation Reporting Form	66

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION AND EVALUATION DESIGN

Introduction

The Hartford Project Concern Program began in September of 1966 as an experiment in educational intervention for children from Title I schools concentrated in the north end of Hartford.[1] Receiving support from many areas (State of Connecticut Department of Education, The Hartford Board of Education, The Hartford Court of Common Council, The Greater Hartford Chamber of Commerce, The Urban League, Community Renewal Team, The NAACP, The Alliance of Ministers, The PTA, The Archdiocese of Hartford, parents, Boards of Education from the five original participating communities, administrators, teachers, members of the legislature, and religious leaders other than the Alliance of Ministers or the Archdiocese of Hartford), the project developed seven objectives in the original application to the Federal Government for funds under Title IV of the Civil Rights Act of 1964.

These objectives were as follows:

1. To develop a structure between a city and its suburbs that will desegregate schools.
2. To discover the attitudes of children, parents, educators, and the community when city children are bussed to the suburbs.
3. To learn what happens to the educational achievement of both city and suburban children when city children go to suburban schools.

---

[1] Information relating to the history and current enrollment status of Project Concern was obtained from project materials.

4. To find out what social activities city children can participate in when they go to school in the suburbs.

5. To encourage Connecticut towns to think about desegregation of schools in regional terms.

6. To train school administrators, teachers, and aides for intergrated schools.

7. To find out what communities can do to make bussing effective.

From 1966 to the present, participation of suburban communities has been increased from five communities (265 children attending 35 schools) to thirteen communities with 1,058 students attending 75 schools. In addition, during the 1979-1980 school year 81 students attended six non-public schools in four communities and 289 students attended five inner-city schools in the south end of Hartford.

As the Project Concern program has grown, so have the inquiries regarding its effectiveness. More specifically, school boards, educators, and citizens in participating communities have been asking whether Project Concern is successful from an educational standpoint. The difficulty in answering this question lies in defining the term "successful". Some accept the ability of students of differing races to interact effectively as evidence of the success of Project Concern. Others seek measures of cognitive and affective test growth as evidence of program success.

Two in-depth inquiries into the impact of Project Concern for the suburban, non-public and inner-city components were initiated during the 1975-1976 and 1976-1977 school years when the Capitol Region Education Council received grants from the Connecticut State Department of Education

to evaluate the program. Further information regarding the rationale and results of these two evaluations can be found in the documents entitled 1975-1976 Hartford Project Concern Evaluation Report (Iwanicki, 1976) and An Evaluation of the 1976-1977 Hartford Project Concern Program (Iwanicki and Gable, 1977). Further, during the 1977-1978 and 1978-1979 project years an evaluation of the cognitive and affective growth of students in the suburban component was conducted (see An Evaluation of the 1977-1978 Hartford Project Concern Program, Iwanicki and Gable, 1978 and Final Evaluation Report 1978-1979 Hartford Project Concern Program, Iwanicki and Gable, 1979).

Development of the Design for the 1979-1980 Project Concern Evaluation

In early September, 1979, the evaluators attended a series of meetings with Dr. Barbara Braden, Deputy Superintendent, Dr. Robert Nearine, Special Assistant for Evaluation, and Mr. William Paradis, Project Concern Director, to discuss potential directions which could be pursued in evaluating the 1979-1980 Project Concern Program. Through these meetings it was decided that the 1979-1980 Project Concern evaluation effort would address the following areas:

1. Examine the Career Patterns of Project Concern Graduates, Dropouts, and Hartford Non-Participants.
2. Examine the Issue of Attrition from Project Concern.
3. Monitor the Cognitive and Affective Impact of Project Concern.

Analyzing the Career Patterns of Project Concern Graduates, Drop Outs, and Hartford Students

The 1976-1977 evaluation examined the career aspirations and plans of Project Concern graduates from the 1974, 1975, and 1976 classes. The level of career aspiration, work history, and college training were examined for the consistency of career planning and career progression.

For the 25 graduates studied, a relatively high level of occupational and educational success was found. For example, 56% were enrolled in college, 72% were presently or had been employed since graduation and 60% demonstrated consistent career aspirations, work experience, and/or educational training beyond high school. While these findings were quite positive, they were limited as they represented graduates who "made it" and were probably the best adjusted and most able students.

To further examine the impact of Project Concern on student career development, the 1974-1976 study of graduates was replicated using 1977-1979 graduates. Also, two essential comparison groups were included in this study. The first comparison group consisted of Project Concern students who dropped out of the program. The second comparison group consisted of a random sample of Hartford students from the 1977-1979 graduating classes who were eligible for Project Concern, but did not participate in the program.

Examining Attrition from Project Concern

The 1976-1977 report on the evaluation of Project Concern described the development of a management and record keeping system to be used by project staff for monitoring the "who," "where," and "why" of

program attrition for the 1976-1977 school year. Areas covered, included change of address, transfer back to Hartford schools, "no shows," pregnancy, and correctional institution. Of the 111 (8%) students who left the program between August, 1976, and May, 1977, it was found that transfer to Hartford Schools, changes of address, and "no shows" were the primary reasons for attrition. A "no show" is a student enrolled in Project Concern during the summer who does not enter the program in September. The 1979-1980 evaluation of Project Concern replicated this attrition study using procedures similar to the 1976-1977 study. In particular, transfers to Hartford schools were examined comprehensively to determine the specific reasons for their transfers and to document what happened to the students when they returned to the Hartford system. A significant feature of this study is that parents of students in the "no show" category were contacted to determine the specific reason for their child's "no show" status.

Monitoring the Cognitive and Affective Impact of Project concern

For at least the last five years the funding proposal for the Project Concern Program has contained the following performance objectives:

1. Pupils will show month for month gains on an average by grade in Language Development.
2. Pupils will show month for month gains on an average by grade in Math.
3. Pupils will show a positive self-concept and attitude toward the school at the end of a year's participation.

Past evaluations of the cognitive outcomes stated in the program

objectives have utilized individually administered achievement tests (i.e., the Woodcock Reading Mastery Tests and the KeyMath Diagnostic Arithmetic Test). These tests have been administered to a random sample of students at grades 1-8 on a pre- to post test basis. Then, the results have been analyzed and reported as they relate to the program objectives.

Some disadvantages to this approach have become evident over the past few years. First, there are some problems in implementing a pre- to post test design on a yearly basis. By the time new participants are selected, transfers are made, project files are updated, and the logistics of sampling as well as pretesting are worked out, students are not pre-tested until late November or early December. Given that post testing must be conducted in May, there are only about five to six months between the times of pre- and post testing. This is a relatively short period of time for examining pre- post test growth.

Secondly, although the results provide evidence of student growth, such growth cannot be compared to the growth of comparable students in Hartford since the same tests are not used with the general population of students in the Hartford Public Schools. Also, some Project Concern students are becoming exceedingly test wise on the Woodcock and KeyMath. Alternate forms of these tests have been used on a pre- to post test basis over the last five years. Since the same level is used at grades 1-8, students at the upper grade levels are very familiar with the content of the test exercises. A final disadvantage of the approach used in past evaluations is that some members of the education community and the public question the credibility of results based on a random sample.

To alleviate these problems, it was decided that the 1979-1980

and subsequent evaluations of Project Concern would monitor the cognitive performance of all Project Concern students at grades 2-8 on a year to year basis using the same group administered achievement tests that are being used in the Hartford Public Schools. Appropriate levels and forms of the Metropolitan Achievement Test in reading and mathematics would be administered to all project participants in April of the school year. Results from these instruments would be analyzed on a pre- to post test basis (i.e., April of one year to April of the next year) and reported as they relate to the objectives of Project Concern as well as to the general growth of students remaining in Hartford schools.

Along with the Metropolitan Achievement Tests, Project Concern students would also be administered a brief ten item Student Survey. This Student Survey, developed for use in past evaluations of Project Concern, would be used to monitor Project Concern participants' attitude toward school and self-concept on a continuing basis.

Consistent with this policy for monitoring the cognitive and affective performances of Project Concern students, all participants at grade 2-8 were administered the appropriate level and form of the Metropolitan Achievement Test as well as the Student Survey. Hartford Test Specialists administered the Metropolitan Achievement Test to all students participating in the Suburban Public and Non-Public school components of the program. Students participating in the Inner-City component of the program were administered the Metropolitan Achievement Test by their classroom teacher as part of the Hartford Public Schools Spring Testing Program. All Student Surveys were administered by Hartford Test Specialists. While Hartford Test Specialists conducted their achievement testing

activities during the April-June period, the Hartford Spring Testing Program proceeded according to the following schedule:

Grades 4, 5, 6: March 3-14

Grades 2, 3 : April 1-11

Grades 7, 8 : May 2-16

Originally, Hartford Test Specialists planned to complete their achievement testing activities by the middle of May. According to this schedule, students were to be tested in only reading and mathematics. A later decision to test students also in language and spelling resulted in an extension of the testing period. A summary by grade of the forms and levels of the Metropolitan Achievement Tests used as well as the areas tested is presented in Table 1.

At grades 2-4 students were tested using machine scorable booklets, while at grades 5-8 separate machine scorable answer sheets were used. All tests were scored and results reported using the computer facilities of the Hartford Public Schools.

Given this is the first year in which the approach described has been used to assess the performance of Project Concern students, only a descriptive analysis of the results can be provided. Both cognitive and affective results will be reported for students participating in the Suburban Public, Non-Public, and Inner-City components of the Project Concern Program. Beginning next year, it will be possible to assess student growth on a year to year basis.

Summary

This chapter has provided some background information concerning

Table 1

A Summary By Grade of the Levels and Form of the Metropolitan Achievement Test
Used to Monitor the Performance of Project Concern Participants As Well As the Areas Tested

	Grade 2	Grade 3	Grade 4	Grades 5-6	Grades 7-8
LEVEL:	Primary II	Elementary	Elementary	Intermediate	Advanced
FORM:	F	F	F	F	F
AREAS TESTED:					
	Word Knowledge	Word Knowledge	Word Knowledge	Word Knowledge	Word Knowledge
	Word Analysis				
	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading
	Language	Language	Language	Language	Language
	Spelling	Spelling	Spelling	Spelling	Spelling
	Math Computation	Math Computation	Math Computation	Math Computation	Math Computation
	Math Concepts	Math Concepts	Math Concepts	Math Concepts	Math Concepts
				Math Problem Solving	Math Problem Solving

the Hartford Project Concern Program and an overview of evaluation activities pursued during the 1979-1980 school year. Subsequent chapters contain more specific information concerning the design of each component of the evaluation as well as a presentation and discussion of the findings derived.

CHAPTER II

Examination of the Career Patterns of Project Concern Graduates, Dropouts, and Hartford Non-Participants

Background

The 1976-1977 evaluation examined the career patterns of Project Concern graduates from the 1974, 1975, and 1976 classes. The level of career aspiration, work history, and college training were examined for the consistency of career planning and career progression.

For the 25 graduates studied, a relatively high level of occupational and educational success was found. For example, 56% were enrolled in college, 72% were presently or had been employed since graduation and 60% demonstrated consistent career aspirations, work experience, and/or educational training beyond high school. While these findings were quite positive, they were limited as they represented graduates who "made it" and were probably the best adjusted and most able students.

Research Design and Data Analysis

To further the evaluation of the effects of Project Concern in the area of career development a more comprehensive study was carried out which replicated the 1976-1977 Project Concern graduate findings and included two comparison groups: Project Concern dropouts and Hartford students.

Groups Studied. The 1977, 1978, and 1979 Project Concern graduates totaled 105 students. Fifteen students from each year were randomly selected for the follow-up study, yielding a sample of 45 students. The second group, Project Concern dropouts, consisted of 15 students who met the following criteria:

1. Participated at least 2 years in Project Concern.
2. Dropped out of the project in either 6, 7, or 8th grade.
3. Returned to and graduated from the Hartford school system.

Initially, 47 students were identified from the potential 1977-1979 graduating classes who left the project. Of these 47, only 15 met all of the criteria listed above.

The third group, Hartford non-participants, consisted of 10 students randomly selected from each of the 1977-1979 Hartford graduating classes. This sample of 30 students met the following criteria:

1. Attended Hartford elementary and secondary schools.
2. Attended Title I eligible schools.
3. Were eligible to be selected for Project Concern (i.e., not in special education).

Ideally, these students were also going to be screened to eliminate any students who were selected, but chose not to participate in Project Concern. This final screening was not possible since records of those invited to participate were not available. This does not appear to be a problem, though, as the probability of such a student being in the sample is quite low.

Instrumentation. For the 1976-1977 evaluation, a management and record keeping system was developed by the evaluators in conjunction with Project Concern staff. The form developed was revised slightly to

obtain additional information about the occupational and educational plans for the three groups in this study. A copy of the form is included in Appendix A.

Data Gathering. Project Concern staff conducted the follow-up of the Project Concern graduate group. Forms were mailed to each of the 45 selected students. Follow-up phone calls and mailings were conducted to enhance the return rate. Forms for the dropout and non-participant groups were sent out through the Hartford Public Schools, Office of Research and Evaluation. Prior to the initial mailing, the last known address on each student's cumulative file was verified by phone. Four students from the non-participant group could not be located and were replaced by four randomly selected students. After the initial mailing, follow-up procedures consisted of phone calls, a second mailing, and in a few cases, a home visit.

Data Analysis. Data analysis consisted of developing frequencies and percentages for each item on the questionnaire. Responses to some items were coded for level of career aspiration and consistency prior to calculating the percentages. Comparisons were then made between the three target groups. Responses to open-ended questions were recorded on typescripts for interpretation. Where appropriate, chi-square statistics were calculated.

Results

Survey Return Rates. The meaningfulness of any career pattern study is dependent upon achieving respectable return rates. Due to the dedication and organizational ability of the Project Concern and Hartford Public Schools Research Office Staff, the return rates for this study are quite

high. Table 2 contains the number of forms sent and returned by year of graduation. Perusal of the table indicates that the return rates ranged

Table 2

Survey Return Rates for Graduates,

Dropouts and Non-Participants

Graduation Year	Project Concern Graduates		Project Concern Dropouts		Hartford Non-Participants	
	Sent	Returned	Sent	Returned	Sent	Returned
1977	15	13	4	3	10	7
1978	15	13	4	4	10	4
1979	15	13	7	6	10	8
TOTAL	45	39	15	13	30	19
Return Rate		87%		87%		63%

from 63% for the non-participants to 87% for the dropout group. These return rates appear adequate for making comparisons between the groups in the area of career patterns.

Demographic Variables. Three demographic variables were included on the questionnaire: sex, marital status, and number of children. These data were collected primarily to determine if significant disparities existed between the three groups on factors which could potentially affect career aspiration, college attendance, and career development. No significant differences were found between the groups at the ($p < .05$) level of significance. For example, with respect to sex, 42% of the non-participants, 39% of the dropouts, and 56% of the Project Concern participants were male. Only 11% of the non-participants were married, while none of the dropouts

and 5% of the Project Concern graduate group were married. Twenty-one percent (21%) of the non-participant group had children, while 15% of the dropouts and 5% of the Project Concern graduates reported having children.

Similar to the 1976-1977 evaluation, several items were used which when taken singly or in combination provide some strong indicators of career aspiration, career planning and overall career development.

Career Aspiration. Respondents were asked, When you were in high school, what type of job or career did you want to have after high school? The response to each item was coded using the North-Hatte Occupational Prestige Rating Scale. This rating is based on a national opinion survey of the relative prestige of various occupations. Generally, higher levels of prestige are ascribed to the occupations which require high levels of education or training and provide a greater financial return. The validity of this rating system has been demonstrated in a number of research studies from 1949 to the present. The occupational prestige rating groups are divided into ten categories. For the purposes of this study, each career/occupational choice stated by the respondent was assigned a numerical value from one (high) to ten (low) based on its' location on the scale. Specific occupations and their relative rankings are shown in Appendix B to further illustrate the ranking system.

On high school occupational choice there were significant differences between the groups when comparing the level of aspiration of respondents. Sixty-four percent of the graduates, 54% of the dropouts, and only 32% of the non-participants aspired to occupations in the upper six ranks. The difference between the graduates and the non-participants was statistically significant ($X^2 = 5.43$, $df = 1$, $p < .05$). While not statistically

significant, a difference was found between groups in the number who indicated they were undecided about a career choice or did not respond to the question. Twenty-one percent (21%) of the non-participants, 31% of the dropouts and only 10% of the graduates were in the undecided/ non-responding category.

A second question on the survey asked the respondent, What type of job or career would you like to have five years from now? Responses on this question were similar for the three groups. Sixty-three percent (63%) of the non-participant job/career choices were in the upper six ranks, while dropouts and graduates had 67% and 62% respectively in these ranks. The undecided/non-responding percentages for the non-participant (5%), dropout (8%), and graduate groups (8%) were also quite similar. At first, these career choice data suggest that the non-participants have similar career aspirations as the dropout and graduate groups, but this may not be a valid conclusion. The next sections of this report will examine the consistency of career patterns of each group. It will be shown that the career patterns of the non-participants were generally inconsistent, and that they have a generally lower rate of participation in post-high school education and/or vocational training. Thus, the career choices they made are likely to be unrealistically high.

Consistency of Career Planning and Pattern. Another element which was taken from the 1976-1977 evaluation of Project Concern graduates was the consistency of career planning and career progression or pattern. The career planning and career pattern for respondents from each of the three groups was examined using four pieces of data. These were the two questions discussed earlier dealing with job/career choice, work history and

post-high school educational activities. The career pattern for each respondent was categorized into one of three groups: consistent, inconsistent, or mixed. A consistent career pattern was one in which the occupational choice (particularly the five years in the future choice) was reinforced by a work history and/or post-secondary education activity which would likely lead to the attainment of the occupational choice. A typical pattern for each of the three categories is presented in Appendix C to assist the reader in understanding how these determinations were made.

A summary of the consistency of the career patterns for the three groups is shown in Table 3. These data indicate that, when compared to

Table 3

Career Pattern Analysis for Non-Participants,

Project Concern Dropouts, and Project Concern Graduates by Percent

Career Pattern	Groups					
	Non-Participants		Dropout		Graduates	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
Consistent	7	37	10	80	26	67
Inconsistent	9	47	3	20	7	18
Mixed	3	16	0	0	6	15

the non-participants (37%), a significantly higher percentage of both the graduates (67%; $X^2 = 4.63$, df = 1, $p < .05$) and dropouts (80%; $X^2 = 4.97$, df = 1, $p < .05$) exhibit consistent career planning and progression. This finding lends support to the view that participation in Project Concern

may facilitate the development of more consistent career patterns.[1]

Work History and Educational Training. Two significant factors in career development are work history and the training or educational preparation of the individual. Respondents were asked to record their work history, which included the number of jobs held, job titles, whether the employment was full-time or part-time and whether they liked the job (Item #3). In terms of the employment statistics among respondents from the three groups, the total percentages of persons having had at least one job since high school were very similar. Eighty-nine percent (89%) of the non-participant group, 77% of the dropouts, and 87% of the graduates had held at least one job since high school graduation. An analysis of the profiles of job holding behavior indicated that the non-participant group tended to report having held only one job, while dropouts and graduates were more likely to report having two or more different jobs. It is likely that the graduates and dropouts report holding more jobs as a result of short term employment held during educational or vocational training. Since fewer non-participants had post-secondary educational/vocational training, they tended to stay at one job for longer periods of time.

While not a statistically significant difference, a larger percentage (64%) of the graduates reported having had at least one full-time job than either dropouts (56%) or non-participants (58%). A similar

---

[1] The data for Project Concern graduates shows a slight improvement in career planning/progression over the Project Concern group studied in the 1976-1977 evaluation. In the 1976-1977 evaluation, 60% of the respondents were judged to have consistent career patterns, while 67% of the present group had consistent career patterns.

finding was noted on the question of whether the respondent "liked" the job which was reported. The percentage of graduates reporting they liked the different jobs was 77% as compared to 54% for dropouts and 58% for non-participants.

Respondents were also asked, How long were you out of high school before you got your first full-time job? The mean number of months before securing full-time employment was computed for each group based on those who responded to the question. Non-participants averaged 7.2 months to secure full-time employment while dropouts averaged 3.9 months and Project Concern graduates averaged 3.4 months. While the period of time was the longest for the non-participants, the differences between the groups was not statistically significant at the $p < .05$ level. Since the question instructed those who had not been employed full-time to leave the item blank, it was assumed that the percentage of non-response indicated the percentage of those who had not secured full-time employment. The respective percentages for non-participants, Project Concern dropouts and Project Concern graduates were 47%, 46%, and 36%.

On the question regarding post-high school education and/or vocational training there were some significant differences between the groups. A significantly higher percentage of graduates (72%) reported some type of post-high school education and/or training than did the dropout group (39%; $X^2 = 4.67$; $df = 1$, $p < .05$). Only 53% of the non-participant group reported some type of post-high school education and/or training. Although considerably lower than the graduate group, this percentage was not statistically different from the graduate group at the $p < .05$ level.

There were a number of individual items on the survey questionnaire which required either a YES/NO response or a selected response from among two or more forced choice options. These items, along with the response percentages for each group, are shown in Table 4. No significant differences were found between the groups.

Table 4

Response by Percent to Survey Items by Group[1]

Item		Graduates	Group Dropouts	Non-Participants
2. Are you now taking training for or employed in the career you wanted to follow at the time you left high school?	YES	68	58	56
4. How do you like your present job? (If unemployed, answer with respect to your last job.)	a. Like it very much.	63	55	50
	b. Like it fairly well.	23	27	31
	c. Do not like it.	3	9	13
	d. Never had a full-time job.	11	9	6
7. What effect did your high school education have on the jobs you have held since graduating from high school?	a. No effect.	30	40	19
	b. Helped me to get the job I wanted.	49	40	62
	c. Have never had a full-time job.	21	20	19
8. What has been the main difficulty you have experienced in your present job? (If unemployed, answer with respect to your last job.)	a. No particular difficulty.	63	70	87
	b. My schooling did not prepare me well enough to do the job.	6	20	0
	c. Conflicts with supervisors.	9	0	0
	d. Have never had a full-time job.	19	10	13
	e. Other (Please explain).	3	0	0

[1]Percentages of respondents indicating they have not had a full-time job differs across items since some students left the item blank.

The data indicate some interesting contrasts. Project Concern graduates (68%) were more likely to be taking training for, or employed in the career they wanted when they left high school (Item #2) than drop-outs (58%) or non-participants (56%). The graduate group was also more favorable in terms of liking their present job (Item #4). However, the non-participants were stronger in their belief that their schooling helped them to get the job they wanted, and they were more likely to indicate that there were no difficulties with their present employment (Item #8).

Since the bulk of the data presented earlier would seem to attest that Project Concern graduates were more likely to aspire to higher level occupations, have more consistent career patterns and be generally more successful both vocationally and educationally, it may seem that the last two pieces of data are inconsistent with the pattern. This may not be the case. First, it is logical that graduates would comment that high school did not help them to get the job they wanted. That is why they are involved in post secondary school training programs. Also, the greater incidence of difficulties encountered by graduates in their work settings may be a function of their lack of satisfaction with the job. Their job may simply be a vehicle for making the necessary money to continue their post secondary school educational activities which will allow them to move into their desired occupation.

Conclusions

This chapter has presented an analysis of the career patterns of Project Concern graduates, dropouts, and non-participating Hartford students. The areas examined were career aspiration, consistency of career planning and pattern, work history, and educational training. Several statistically

significant differences were found which consistently favored the Project Concern graduates. The first section of the conclusions will summarize these findings as Primary Conclusions. The second section, entitled Secondary Conclusions, will present "trends" which generally favored the graduates but did not reach statistical significance.

Primary Conclusions. Based upon the analyses carried out, the following primary conclusions are forwarded:

- Occupational choices made in high school were at a significantly higher occupational level for Project Concern graduates than those for the non-participants.
- Project Concern graduates (67%) and dropouts (80%) were judged to have significantly more consistent career patterns when compared to non-participants (37%).
- A significantly larger percentage of Project Concern graduates (72%) was involved in post-high school education and/or vocational training than project dropouts (39%).

Secondary Conclusions. Based upon the analyses carried out, the following secondary conclusions or "trends" are forwarded:

- Project Concern graduates required less time (3.4 months) in finding full-time employment after high school graduation than dropouts (3.9 months) or non-participants (7.2 months).
- A larger percentage of Project Concern graduates (90%) made vocational choices in high school than dropouts (69%) or non-participants (79%).
- Project Concern graduates and dropouts would appear to be more realistic in their future career choices (5 years from now) than non-participants.
- Project Concern graduates (64%) were more likely to have held a full-time job when compared to dropouts (56%) and non-participants (58%).
- Project Concern graduates were more likely (68%) to be employed in or taking training for the career they wanted while they were in high school than either dropouts (58%) or non-participants (56%).

- A larger percentage of Project Concern graduates (77%) reported that they liked their jobs than did dropouts (54%) or non-participants (58%).
- A larger percentage of graduates "liked" their present job when compared to dropouts or non-participants.
- Project Concern graduates tend to report more difficulties with their present job than non-participants.
- Project Concern graduates are less likely to feel that their high school education helped them get the job they wanted when compared to non-participants.

Clearly the data presented here provide strong support for the contention that Project Concern has a positive effect on the career development and maturity of the students who participate in the program. Project Concern graduates exhibit significantly higher levels of aspiration and significantly more consistent career planning and progression than non-participants. While not statistically significant, graduates also are more likely to seek post-secondary education or vocational training when compared to non-participants. Although not as consistent as program graduates, those students who dropped out of Project Concern prior to graduation tended to show a number of positive benefits as well. Measured against those who did not participate in Project Concern, graduates and dropouts alike appear to have received significant career development benefits.

CHAPTER III

Examination of the Issue of Attrition from Project Concern

During each school year approximately 8% of the Project Concern students leave the program. During the 1976-1977 evaluation, a management and record keeping system was developed for monitoring the "who," "where," and "why" for 117 (8.4%) students who left the project. This information is important if project staff are to meet the needs of all participants in the hope of reducing future student attrition. During the 1979-1980 year, the record system was again employed for the purpose of replicating the 1976-1977 attrition study. In particular, the areas of transfers to Hartford Public Schools and "No Shows" were targeted for comprehensive follow-up.

Design and Implementation of the Attrition Study

The record system used to monitor student attrition was the same one used in the 1976-1977 evaluation. Areas covered included: change of address, transfer to another school, no shows, pregnancy, correctional institutions, and other reasons. Included within each area were several sub-categories which will be presented in the tables to follow. Appendix D contains a copy of the attrition form.

Treatment of Data

The attrition data were gathered by project staff for 112 students who left the project between September, 1979, and June, 1980. Data analysis consisted of descriptive frequencies and percentages for each category in the attrition form. Open-ended comments were summarized for later inclusion in the report.

Results of the Attrition Study

During the September, 1979, to June, 1980, period, 112 of 1,373 or 8.2% of the students left the project. This figure can be compared to an attrition rate of 8.4% (117/1,386) during the 1976-1977 year. Table 5 contains a breakdown of the attrition figures by category and grade level. Perusal of the table indicates that Transfers to Another School and Change of Address were the main reasons for attrition. These figures are similar to those obtained in 1976-1977, except for the "Now Show" area which was reduced from 22% to 5% of the cases of attrition. In the sections which follow, each category on the attrition form will be discussed separately. Prior to this, the grade level breakdown will be presented.

Grade Level. Examination of the attrition rates in Table 5 indicates that the highest frequencies of students leaving the program are found between grades 4 and 10. From another perspective, the highest percentages are found for the elementary (grades 1-6, 46%) and the secondary levels (grades 9-12, 36%). Finally, note that the ninth grade year is associated with the highest frequency of attrition (19 cases).

Change of Address. Of those leaving the project, 39% (44 students) left between grades 1 and 9 due to a change in their parents' address.

Table 5

Frequency of Students Leaving Project Concern

by Reason and Grade Level

Grade Level	Reason/Frequency: Change of Address	Transfer to Another School[a]	No Show	Pregnancy	Correctional Institution	Other	Total
Elementary: 45%							
1	1	4	3				8
2	2	2					4
3	4	1	1				6
4	7	2	1				10
5	7	6					13
6	7	2	1				10
Middle: 19%							
7	4	7					11
8	7	3					10
Secondary: 36%							
9	5	13[a]		1			19
10		14		1			15
11		3					3
12		2				1	3
TOTAL	44	59	6	2	0	1	112
PERCENTAGE	39%	53%	5%	2%		1%	

[a]All Transfers to Another School were to Hartford Public Schools except two private and two technical school transfers at grade 9.

Fourteen moved out of state, 26 moved out of the city and four moved out of the Project Concern district. Note, that students moving out of the district are provided the opportunity to remain in the project. Bus tokens are provided to transport the students to a Project Concern bus stop. Parents of the four students listed apparently did not wish to participate in these arrangements or drive their children directly to the Project Concern School.

Transfer to Another School. Table 5 also indicates that 53% of those leaving the project (59 students) transferred to another school. Most of this group (55 students) returned to the Hartford Public Schools. Two students each transferred to a private school and a technical school. The specific reasons for the 55 students returning to Hartford Public Schools were further examined. Table 5 indicates that these transfers took place at all grade levels with the highest frequencies found at grades 10, 9, and 7. Table 6 presents a breakdown of the reasons for the transfers. The primary reasons for returning to the Hartford Public Schools appear to be Social, Disciplinary, and Special Education. All of the reasons listed in Table 6 will be discussed in the order they are presented in the table. Note that the 65 cases referred to in the table represent 55 students; 10 students were associated with two reasons each.

Special education recommendations accounted for 13 students. These students were identified by the suburban schools as possibly needing some form of a full-time special support program. Subsequent to the identification, some students were referred to the Dwight Diagnostic Center for a full diagnostic evaluation. During a three week period, appropriate professionals (educational, psychological, language/speech clinician,

Table 6

Reasons for 55 Student Transfers to the Hartford Public Schools and Associated Student Frequencies

Reason	Frequency
Recommended for Special Education	13
Recommended for Special Academic Program	5
Disciplinary	14
Social	16
Part-Time Employment	--
Medical	2
Parent Home Need	--
Other	15
TOTAL	65[a]

[a]Note that the 65 cases represent 55 students as 10 students were associated with two reasons each.

social worker, and pediatrician worked with each student. The result was a recommendation for educational programming sent to the Hartford receiving school PAT.[1] In other cases where sufficient information was available from the suburban school, direct placements were made as the referral information was directed to the special education coordinator.

The 13 students recommended for special education were followed to ascertain the results of the referral. Appendix E contains documentation for each student's grade level, departing and receiving school, recommendation, and placement decision. Note that the students' names and addresses have been deleted. Perusal of the documentation indicates that 10 of the 13 students are receiving the recommended services.

During the 1979-1980 school year, parents of the three students not placed after evaluation at the Dwight Center had refused to sign for the placement. These three placements are scheduled for September, 1980. It should be noted that the implementation of the Dwight Diagnostic Center placement recommendations is often held up several months when schools are unable to obtain parental consent. No delays are associated with direct placements since all arrangements are made prior to the student's return from the suburban school.

Special Academic Program recommendations were made for five students. These programs were not available in the suburban school. In most cases the programs consisted of more extensive individual academic instruction.

Disciplinary and Social reasons were listed for 14 and 16 students respectively. In several cases the disciplinary and social reasons were found to be related and consisted of non-compliance with school regulations. In some cases students desired to return to Hartford to be closer

[1] PAT refers to Pupil Appraisal Team.

to their friends for social reasons which included athletic activities. Note that the percentage of students returning to the Hartford Schools for disciplinary and social reasons has increased from 33% in 1976-1977 to approximately 50% during the 1979-1980 school year.[1]

Part-Time Employment and Home Need were not listed for any students returning to Hartford.

Medical reasons were listed for two students returning to Hartford. One student enrolled in a drug rehabilitation program and the other in a residential psychiatric program.

The "Other" category was applicable for 15 students. The primary reason listed was excessive absences. Following this, reasons listed for individual students were such areas as failing to complete academic requirements, parental request, and transportation problems.

In addition to the returns to Hartford Public Schools, four students transferred to Private and Technical schools at the grade 9 level. The two reasons stated for the private school transfers dealt with parental feelings that college admission would be enhanced by attending the private school. For the two technical school transfers, parents felt that the suburban school had a limited curriculum in the technical area.

No Shows. A "No Show" is a student who enrolls in the program during the summer but does not enter the program in September. The 1976-1977 evaluation found that 22% of the total attrition group was in the "No Show" category. This year only 5% (6/112) of such cases were identified. Program staff are to be commended for their efforts in this area

[1]The approximate figure of 50% is used since two students represented both disciplinary and social categories. Part of this "increase" is created by the overall decrease in the number of No Shows during the 1979-1980 year.

since the 1976-1977 evaluation and subsequent recommendations. The primary reason for the reduction in "No Shows" is the expanded emphasis placed upon comprehensive parental orientation during the summer (e.g., bus schedules). Parents of prospective Project Concern students were contacted by phone and told about all aspects of the program. A bilingual staff member called all Hispanic parents. These calls were then followed by a letter further describing the child's participation in the project. A secondary reason for the reduction was the comprehensive screening of each student's history for special education situations prior to entrance into the program.

As a result of these project efforts, only six students were found to be "No Shows." Three students were in grade 1, and the remaining were enrolled in grades 3, 4, and 6 respectively. Two of the students' parents moved during the summer, two students wanted to stay in Hartford with their friends, and two grade 1 parents felt the bus stop was too far from home.

Pregnancy. Two students left the program due to pregnancy (grades 9 and 10) and are now enrolled in the Teenage Parents Program.

Other. One grade 12 student was listed in the attrition group who was terminated from school due to excessive absences.

Summary

This chapter has presented an analysis of attrition from Project Concern. The "who," "where," and "why" data for 112 students leaving the program were documented. This attrition rate of 8.2% (112/1,373) was comparable to the 8.4% rate found in the 1976-1977 evaluation. The

highest frequencies of attrition were found between grades 4 and 10. Similar to the 1976-1977 evaluation, the main reasons for attrition were Transfers to Another School and Change of Address. Most of the transfers to Hartford Public Schools were for Disciplinary and Social reasons, as well as recommendations for full-time Special Education needs which could not be met in the suburban school. Contrary to the 1976-1977 evaluation report, the category of "No Shows" was not a primary reason for student attrition. Project staff have made a significant effort at communicating all aspects of the program (often in Spanish) to parents of prospective Project Concern students during the summer orientation process.[1]

[1]It should also be noted that ten students were identified by the suburban schools as having special academic needs. All of these students were "internal transfers" or students who returned to Hartford and remained in the In-City Project Concern component since the needed services could be provided.

CHAPTER IV

MONITORING THE COGNITIVE AND AFFECTIVE IMPACT OF PROJECT CONCERN

Monitoring Cognitive Impact

As discussed in Chapter I, a new approach to the evaluation of the cognitive impact of the Project Concern program was implemented during the 1979-1980 school year. In implementing this approach, data were collected regarding the basic skill performance of Project Concern participants in the spring of 1980. Such baseline data obtained from a single testing of Project Concern participants cannot be used to assess the impact of the program on the basic skill growth of students. This will not be possible until this year's participants are tested again in the spring of 1981. Thus, the purpose of this section is not to provide evidence regarding the impact of the Project Concern program on student performance, but rather, to discuss the procedures employed in implementing the new evaluation design and to provide a descriptive summary of the baseline data collected.

The approach designed to monitor the cognitive impact of the Project Concern program consisted of testing all participants in the vicinity of April of the school year using the Metropolitan Achievement Test. During the 1979-1980 school year, Project Concern participants were tested using the Metropolitan Achievements during the period of early April to early June, 1980. In March, 1980, complete rosters of students enrolled in each component of the Project Concern program were obtained. This

information was forwarded to Hartford Test Specialists who arranged to test each student participating in the suburban and non-public school components of the program. In addition, rosters for students participating in the inner-city component were forwarded to the Hartford Public Schools Office of Testing. Here, staff provided the Metropolitan Achievement Test results of Inner-City participants when they were available. The number of students served in each component of Project Concern as well as the number and percent of students tested using the Metropolitan Achievement Test is summarized in Table 7. From Table 7, it is evident that the majority of students (at least 92%) in each component were tested using the Metropolitan Achievement Test.

Before discussing the results of the Metropolitan Achievement Tests, it is important to comment on the test administration process. Although Hartford Test Specialists were very conscientious in organizing testing activities in suburban and non-public schools to proceed smoothly and not disturb the educational process as it effected Project Concern students, some problems did arise. Given that over two hours was needed to administer the Metropolitan Achievement Tests, it was difficult to administer these tests to students without disrupting their educational program somewhat. In some cases students at the upper grade levels resented being taken away from their normal school activities to be tested, especially by "strangers". Also in some schools, suitable space was not available to conduct the testing. If Hartford Test Specialists are to administer the Metropolitans in future years, it is essential that local school staff and Project Concern aides make a strong effort to orient program participants to the importance of these testing activities

Table 7

Summary of the Number and Percent of

Project Concern Students Served and Tested by

Program Component and Grade Level

Grade	Suburban			Non-Public			In-City		
	Served	Tested		Served	Tested		Served	Tested	
	N	N	%	N	N	%	N	N	%
2	77	74	96%	6	6	100%	15	13	87%
3	86	84	98%	7	7	100%	19	13	68%
4	81	81	100%	7	7	100%	42	36	86%
5	102	101	99%	6	6	100%	41	40	98%
6	104	101	97%	16	16	100%	43	42	98%
7	104	104	100%	11	11	100%	39	39	100%
8	71	63	100%	16	16	100%	42	39	93%
Totals	625	608	97%	69	69	100%	241	222	92%

and to make appropriate space available for testing.

Given the number of students being tested and the cost of using Hartford Test Specialists to administer the Metropolitans, it might be advisable to consider the alternative of asking schools participating in Project Concern to accept responsibility for these testing activities. Each school could be provided with test materials as well as funds to cover the additional staff expenses incurred through such testing. Local schools could then test Project Concern participants at the time prescribed in the Hartford Spring Testing Program Schedule and forward completed materials to the Project Concern office. The advantage of this approach would be that students would be tested by persons with whom they were more familiar. In addition, since testing activities would be controlled at the building level, they could be scheduled to minimize conflict with other educational activities. The disadvantage to this approach is that some uniformity in the manner in which the tests are administered would be lost.

A summary by grade level of the mean Metropolitan Achievement Test standard score performance of Project Concern students in all test areas is presented by program component in Tables 8-10. Standard scores report achievement in equal interval units. These standard scores can be compared across forms and levels of the Metropolitan Achievement Tests within a particular skill area. For example, for the areas of Total Reading, it is evident that sixth grade suburban school students exhibited a higher level of performance (78) than fourth grade suburban school students (67). For this reason, future evaluations should examine the year to year growth exhibited by Project Concern students in each skill area using standard scores. It is important to note that standard scores cannot be compared

Table 8

Summary By Grade Level of Mean Metropolitan Achievement Test Standard Score Performance In All Test Areas for Project Concern Students In the Suburban School Component

Grade	N	Word Knowledge	Word Analysis	Reading	Total Reading	Language	Spelling	Mathematics Comprehension	Mathematics Concepts	Mathematics Problems	Total Mathematics
2	70	56.87	54.31	54.90	55.41		58.43	54.19	52.22		
3	84	64.02		61.63	61.94		68.95	67.36	64.27		
4	81	67.96		68.54	67.33	73.67	76.46	78.65	72.67	71.42	78.19
5	101	72.80		74.03	73.21	79.51	77.90	84.10	75.74	76.18	83.48
6	101	77.93		77.82	78.13	83.06	85.72	88.42	80.40	81.93	87.90
7	103	84.34		80.68	83.21	88.02	92.77	94.85	83.84	89.39	94.76
8	62	87.23		83.15	86.43	90.27	96.77	98.93	86.87	93.63	98.97

Table 9

Summary By Grade Level of Mean Metropolitan Achievement Test Standard Score Performance In All Test Areas for Project Concern Students In the Non-Public School Component

Grade	N	Word Knowledge	Word Analysis	Reading	Total Reading	Language	Spelling	Mathematics Comprehension	Mathematics Concepts	Mathematics Problems	Total Mathematics
2	6	66.17	61.33	59.67	63.67		68.67	58.67	59.17		
3	7	67.71		67.14	66.57		76.00	72.86	73.57		
4	7	74.14		72.71	73.14	79.71	79.71	84.00	78.14	79.86	85.00
5	6	83.83		82.83	83.50	89.17	81.83	87.00	86.33	83.33	89.67
6	16	83.63		82.25	83.00	88.60	91.07	88.75	84.69	84.63	90.19
7	11	84.46		83.91	84.54	90.18	98.91	96.46	86.46	84.46	95.00
8	16	97.06		96.56	98.56	100.44	101.31	103.25	95.87	100.27	105.53

Table 10

Summary By Grade Level of Mean Metropolitan Achievement Test Standard Score Performance In All Test Areas for Project Concern Students In the Inner-City School Component

Grade	N	Word Knowledge	Word Analysis	Reading	Total Reading	Language	Spelling	Mathematics Comprehension	Mathematics Concepts	Mathematics Problems	Total Mathematics
2	13	51.20	51.80	48.60	49.40		57.93	52.17	51.27		
3	13	59.11		59.00	57.68		66.11	63.68	60.20		
4	36	62.21		61.26	60.86	66.02	68.52	72.58	66.05	68.18	72.70
5	40	67.05		71.17	68.29	74.34	75.46	80.05	73.00	73.25	80.2
6	42	69.70		70.28	69.44	77.30	75.40	83.69	74.05	74.33	82.38
7	39	81.55		80.46	81.44	84.77	91.90	92.97	81.69	85.74	92.05
8	39	84.91		84.55	85.31	88.26	94.67	98.41	88.81	90.48	97.79

across skill areas. For example at grade 4, one cannot conclude that the Total Math performance of students in the suburban school component (78) is superior to their Total Reading performance (67).

Since this is the first year in which all students participating in Project concern have been tested using the Metropolitan Achievement Tests, it is not possible to assess the extent to which significant year to year growth has been exhibited. In subsequent years this will be possible.

In addition to Tables 8-10, the Metropolitan Achievement Test performance of students in each component is presented in grade-equivalent, percentile, and normal curve equivalent scores in Tables 11-13 for the following major skill areas:

1. Total Reading,
2. Language,
3. Mathematics Computation,
4. Total Mathematics.

Grade equivalent scores are presented since they are found by some to be desirable. The problem with grade equivalent scores is that they are not expressed in equal interval units. They cannot be used to quantitatively compare scores on a particular test or to make comparisons across tests. For example, one cannot say that for suburban students the difference in Total Reading achievement between grades 2 and 3 (7 months) is the same as the difference between grades 4 and 5 (7 months). The numerical equivalence observed is an artifact of the grade equivalent score distribution and not a function of progress in the skill area being assessed. Also, one cannot say that second grade suburban students exhibited the

same level of performance in Total Reading and Mathematics Computation. Grade equivalent scores can only be used to make qualitative comparisons on a particular test for a particular group. One must be cautious to use grade equivalent scores only in this context. Quantitative numerical comparisons must be made by test area using standard scores.

Tables 11-13 also contain percentile (%ile) scores. Percentile scores can be explained best using an example. A percentile score of 62 in Total Reading for grade 2 suburban participants indicates that on the average, their performance was better than or equal to 62% of the students in the norming population taking that test at grade 2. Like grade equivalents, percentiles are not expressed in equal interval units. The difference between scores at the 80th and 90th percentiles is not the same as the difference between scores at the 50th and 60th percentiles. Percentiles can be standardized (i.e., converted to equal interval units) by converting them to normal curve equivalents (NCE). Normal curve equivalents are also reported in Tables 11-13.

An NCE of 50 is indicative of average performance for students at that grade level in the skill areas tested. For example, suburban school pupils exhibited average performance at grade 2 in Mathematics Computation as evidenced by an NCE of 51. To the extent that the NCE departs from 50, students exhibit above or below average performance in the skill area tested.

In future evaluations of Project Concern, year to year skill growth will be assessed using NCES. Significant growth in a skill area for students at a particular grade level will be assessed by comparing year to year NCE mean performance. An increase from year to year in average NCE performance is indicative of improved student performance.

Table 11

Summary By Grade Level of Mean Metropolitan Achievement Test Performance In Major Skill Areas for Project Concern Students In the Suburban School Component

Grade	N	Total Reading			Language			Mathematics Computation			Total Mathematics		
		GE	%ile	NCE	GE	%ile	NCE	GE	%ile	NCE	GE	%ile	NCE
2	70	2.9	62	56				2.9	52	51			
3	84	3.6	54	52				4.0	58	54			
4	81	4.2	40	45	4.6	38	44	5.1	52	51	4.5	38	44
5	101	4.9	34	41	5.4	38	44	5.7	48	49	5.1	36	42
6	101	5.6	32	40	5.9	30	39	6.2	36	42	5.7	32	40
7	103	6.4	36	42	7.0	38	44	7.1	42	46	6.8	38	44
8	62	6.9	30	39	7.4	32	40	7.9	40	45	7.5	36	42

Table 12

Summary By Grade Level of Mean Metropolitan Achievement Test Performance In Major Skill Areas for Project Concern Students In the Non-Public School Component

Grade	N	Total Reading			Language			Mathematics Computation			Total Mathematics		
		GE	%ile	NCE	GE	%ile	NCE	GE	%ile	NCE	GE	%ile	NCE
2	6	3.7	86	73				3.2	76	65			
3	7	4.2	68	60				4.5	76	65			
4	7	4.9	56	53	5.4	58	54	5.7	72	62	5.3	60	55
5	6	6.6	68	60	7.2	68	60	6.1	62	56	6.0	62	56
6	16	6.4	46	48	7.2	52	51	6.3	38	44	6.0	38	44
7	11	6.7	42	46	7.4	44	47	7.3	46	48	6.8	38	44
8	16	9.8	62	56	9.8	58	54	8.8	58	54	8.6	54	52

Table 13

Summary By Grade Level of Mean Metropolitan Achievement Test Performance In Major Skill Areas for Project Concern Students In the Inner-City School Component

Grade	N	Total Reading			Language			Mathematics Computation			Total Mathematics		
		GE	%ile	NCE	GE	%ile	NCE	GE	%ile	NCE	GE	%ile	NCE
2	13	2.4	34	41				2.7	40	45			
3	13	3.2	40	45				3.7	42	46			
4	36	3.5	24	35	3.5	22	34	4.5	34	41	4.0	26	36
5	40	4.3	20	32	4.6	24	35	5.3	34	41	4.7	26	36
6	42	4.4	14	27	5.0	18	31	5.7	24	35	4.9	16	29
7	39	6.0	30	39	6.2	30	39	6.8	36	42	6.4	30	39
8	39	6.7	28	38	7.0	28	38	7.7	36	42	7.3	34	41

In summary, the purpose of this section has been to discuss the procedures employed in implementing the new design for evaluating the cognitive impact of Project Concern and to provide a descriptive summary of the baseline data collected. These data will be used in subsequent evaluations to assess the impact of Project Concern on student basic skill growth.

Monitoring Affective Impact

Since several research studies have shown that affective variables relate to school achievement (see Bloom, Human Characteristics and School Learning and Purkey, Self-Concept and School Achievement), the Student Survey was developed for use in the evaluation of the Project Concern program during the 1977-1978 school year. The Student Survey contains a series of items which assess student self-concept and attitude toward school. It should be noted that the self-concept and attitude variables are complex constructs. The 10 items contained in the Student Survey were selected from the Instructional Objectives Exchange nationally normed item pool for assessing the areas of self-concept and attitude toward school. The complete sets of self-concept and attitude toward school items could not be employed as separate measures due to test length considerations. Since the items selected do represent the self-concept and school attitude domains, they can be employed validly to assess student status. Given the close relationship between how students feel about themselves (self-concept) and their attitudes toward various school situations, the set of 10 items was selected to generally reflect both constructs.

The Student Survey was administered to all participants at grades 2-8 in each component of the Project Concern Program by Hartford Test Specialists in the Spring of 1980. When the completed Student Surveys were forwarded for analysis, survey forms for students in the suburban and non-public school components of Project Concern were grouped together. Since the Student Survey is completed anonymously, it was not possible to separate these surveys into the two respective groups. In subsequent sections, the results of the Student Survey will be discussed for the combined group of students participating in the suburban and non-public school components of Project Concern as well as for those students in the inner-city component.

Tables 14-16 contain the percents and frequencies of students selecting the "True" responses on the Student Survey. Perusal of the Totals responses in Tables 14 and 15 indicates that, overall, the pattern of responses for students participating in the suburban and non-public school components was similar to the pattern for inner-city participants. These data suggest that students in both these groups have a positive self-concept and attitude toward school. This statement can be supported further by an analysis of the items in the survey. The ten items used in the survey reflected three general areas: feelings about school and school work, attitudes toward classroom participation, and feelings about teachers. Since the response patterns for the suburban/non-public and inner-city participants were similar, these responses have been combined in Table 16 to simplify the discussion of the item results. In subsequent sections, item results will be discussed for the combined group of Project Concern Students as reported in Table 16.

Table 14

Percent and Frequency of "True" Responses On the Student Survey By Grade Level for Students Participating In the Suburban and Non-Public Schools Components of the Project Concern Program

Item Stem	GRADE LEVEL 2 (N=64)	3 (N=89)	4 (N=34)	5 (N=107)	6 (N=116)	7 (N=113)	8 (N=77)	TOTALS (N=650)
1. School work is fairly easy for me.	60% (38)	56% (49)	67% (55)	60% (64)	71% (82)	63% (69)	76% (56)	64% (413)
2. My teachers usually like me.	88% (56)	89% (79)	92% (76)	83% (89)	89% (102)	87% (96)	96% (73)	88% (571)
3. I can get good grades if I want to.	65% (41)	80% (71)	88% (73)	88% (94)	83% (95)	91% (100)	95% (71)	84% (545)
4. I often volunteer to do things in class.	73% (47)	82% (73)	72% (60)	78% (83)	75% (86)	63% (70)	59% (44)	71% (463)
5. I often get discouraged in school.	50% (32)	57% (49)	51% (42)	48% (51)	38% (44)	41% (46)	33% (25)	44% (289)
6. I am slow in finishing my school work.	34% (22)	27% (24)	26% (21)	33% (35)	34% (39)	22% (24)	21% (16)	28% (181)
7. I am proud of my school work.	94% (60)	87% (77)	87% (72)	88% (92)	87% (100)	76% (83)	80% (61)	84% (545)
8. I am not doing as well in school as I would like to.	37% (23)	26% (23)	35% (29)	46% (49)	49% (57)	62% (68)	58% (43)	45% (292)
9. I find it hard to talk in front of the class.	40% (25)	54% (48)	48% (40)	48% (51)	48% (54)	40% (45)	40% (30)	45% (293)
10. I don't like to be called on in class.	18% (11)	29% (26)	33% (27)	27% (29)	24% (28)	32% (35)	28% (21)	27% (177)

Table 15

Percent and Frequency of "True" Responses On the Student Survey By Grade Level for Students Participating In the Inner-City Schools Component of the Project Concern Program

Item Stem	GRADE LEVEL 2 (N=12)	3 (N=19)	4 (N=43)	5 (N=38)	6 (N=41)	7 (N=39)	8 (N=40)	TOTALS (N=232)
1. School work is fairly easy for me.	75% (9)	68% (13)	59% (24)	50% (19)	56% (23)	84% (32)	74% (26)	63% (146)
2. My teachers usually like me.	75% (9)	90% (17)	88% (38)	76% (29)	81% (33)	90% (35)	92% (35)	84% (196)
3. I can get good grades if I want to.	68% (8)	74% (14)	84% (36)	82% (31)	81% (33)	82% (32)	97% (37)	82% (191)
4. I often volunteer to do things in class.	58% (7)	72% (13)	88% (38)	82% (31)	63% (26)	71% (27)	74% (28)	73% (170)
5. I often get discouraged in school.	83% (10)	50% (9)	51% (22)	34% (13)	46% (19)	28% (11)	31% (12)	41% (96)
6. I am slow in finishing my school work.	58% (7)	26% (5)	37% (16)	26% (10)	44% (18)	21% (8)	18% (7)	31% (71)
7. I am proud of my school work.	100% (12)	90% (17)	86% (37)	87% (33)	83% (34)	84% (32)	90% (36)	87% (201)
8. I am not doing as well in school as I would like to.	68% (8)	42% (8)	50% (21)	49% (18)	42% (17)	51% (20)	35% (14)	46% (106)
9. I find it hard to talk in front of the class.	91% (10)	61% (11)	44% (19)	53% (20)	32% (13)	33% (13)	58% (23)	47% (109)
10. I don't like to be called on in class.	36% (4)	17% (3)	19% (8)	21% (8)	20% (8)	15% (6)	43% (17)	23% (54)

Table 16

Percent and Frequency of "True" Responses On the Student Survey for Students Participating In All Components of the Project Concern Program (N=882)

Item Stem	Combined Totals
1. School work is fairly easy for me.	63% (559)
2. My teachers usually like me.	87% (767)
3. I can get good grades if I want to.	83% (736)
4. I often volunteer to do things in class.	72% (633)
5. I often get discouraged in school.	44% (385)
6. I am slow in finishing my school work.	29% (252)
7. I am proud of my school work.	85% (746)
8. I am not doing as well in school as I would like to.	45% (389)
9. I find it hard to talk in front of the class.	46% (402)
10. I don't like to be called on in class.	26% (231)

School and School Work. The majority of students feel quite comfortable with their school experience and their school work. For the combined group of grade 2 through 8 respondents, 44% indicated that they often get discouraged in school (item 5) and 45% felt that they were not doing as well in school as they would like to do (item 8). Further, 83% felt that they could get good grades if they wanted to (item 3), 63% felt their school work was fairly easy (item 1), and 85% were proud of their school work (item 7). In addition, only 29% of the Hartford Project Concern students felt that they were slow in finishing their school work (item 6). This is a positive finding in that the Project Concern students probably compare themselves positively to their classroom counterparts in this area of work completion.

Class Participation. The area of class participation is important as the Project Concern students should feel comfortable in their classroom setting. It appears that this is the case since 72% indicated they often volunteer to do things in class (item 4). Further, only 46% felt that they found it hard to talk in front of the class (item 9) and only 26% indicated that they didn't like to be called on in class (item 10).

Teachers. The student perception that their teachers like them is essential for the development of healthy self-images and school attitudes. For the Project Concern students, 87% indicated that their teachers usually liked them (item 2).

With respect to differences in self-concept and school attitudes across grade levels, some anticipated small differences and trends were present but do not appear to be of sufficient magnitude for discussion. Interested readers may wish to examine the grade level data presented

in Tables 14 and 15.

In summary, it can be concluded that the self-concept and school attitudes of the Project Concern students in the areas of school and school work, classroom participation and teachers are quite positive. The affective orientation of students participating in the 1979-1980 Project Concern Program is consistent with the results of past evaluations of Project Concern when the Student Survey was used.

It is important to note that the cognitive and affective information discussed in this chapter is summarized on the Connecticut State Department of Education Compensatory Project Evaluation Reporting Forms in Appendix F.

CHAPTER V

SUMMARY

A summary of the results of the 1979-1980 Hartford Project Concern Program Evaluation is presented in this chapter. The purpose of this summary is to collate for the reader some of the major findings of this evaluation. It is important to note that perceptions of the Project Concern program should not be formed on the basis of this summary alone. All findings must be interpreted in light of the evaluation design utilized, a more complete discussion of the results presented, and the limitations placed on the findings obtained. Such information is presented in Chapters I - IV of this report.

Examining the Career Patterns of Project Concern Graduates, Dropouts, and Hartford Students

This component of the evaluation focused on an analysis of the career patterns of Project Concern graduates, dropouts, and non-participating Hartford students. The areas examined were career aspiration, consistency of career planning and pattern, work history, and educational training. Several statistically significant differences were found which consistently favored the Project Concern Graduates.

Primary Conclusions. Based upon the analyses carried out, the following primary conclusions are forwarded:

- Occupational choices made in high school were at a significantly higher occupational level for Project Concern graduates than those for the non-participants.

- Project Concern graduates (67%) and dropouts (80%) were judged to have significantly more consistent career patterns when compared to non-participants (37%)

- A significantly larger percentage of Project Concern graduates (72%) was involved in post-high school education and/or vocational training than project dropouts (39%).

Secondary Conclusions. Based upon the analyses carried out, the following secondary conclusions or "trends" are forwarded:

- Project Concern graduates required less time (3.4 months) in finding full-time employment after high school graduation than dropouts (3.9 months) or non-participants (7.2 months).

- A larger percentage of Project Concern graduates (90%) made vocational choices in high school than dropouts (69%) or non-participants (79%).

- Project Concern graduates and dropouts would appear to be more realistic in their future career choices (5 years from now) than non-participants.

- Project Concern graduates (64%) were more likely to have held a full-time job when compared to dropouts (56%) and non-participants (58%).

- Project Concern graduates were more likely (68%) to be employed in or taking training for the career they wanted while they were in high school than either dropouts (58%) or non-participants (56%).

- A larger percentage of Project Concern graduates (77%) reported that they liked their jobs than did dropouts (54%) or non-participants (58%).

- A larger percentage of graduates "liked" their present job when compared to dropouts or non-participants.

- Project Concern graduates are less likely to feel that their high school education helped them get the job they wanted when compared to non-participants.

Clearly the data presented here provide strong support for the contention that Project Concern has a positive effect on the career development and maturity of the students who participate in the program. Project Concern graduates exhibit significantly higher levels of aspiration and significantly more consistent career planning and progression than

non-participants. While not statistically significant, graduates also are more likely to seek post-secondary education or vocational training when compared to non-participants. Although not as consistent as program graduates, those students who dropped out of Project Concern prior to graduation tended to show a number of positive benefits as well. Measured against those who did not participate in Project Concern, graduates and dropouts alike appear to have received significant career development benefits.

Examining Attrition From Project Concern

In examining attrition from Project Concern, "who," "where," and "why" data for 112 students leaving the program were documented. This attrition rate of 8.2% (112/1,373) was comparable to the 8.4% rate found in the 1976-1977 evaluation. The highest frequencies of attrition were found between grades 4 and 10. Similar to the 1976-1977 evaluation, the main reasons for attrition were Transfers to Another School and Change of Address. Most of the transfers to Hartford Public Schools were for Disciplinary and Social reasons, as well as recommendations for full-time Special Education needs which could not be met in the suburban school. Contrary to the 1976-1977 evaluation report, the category of "No Shows" was not a primary reason for student attrition. Project staff have made a significant effort at communicating all aspects of the program (often in Spanish) to parents of prospective Project Concern students during the summer orientation process.

Monitoring the Cognitive and Affective Impact of Project Concern

During the 1979-1980 school year a new design was used to evaluate the cognitive impact of the Hartford Project Concern Program. In applying this design, all Project Concern participants at grades 2-8 are tested

each spring using the Metropolitan Achievement Test. The effect of Project Concern on the basic skill performance (i.e., reading, language, and mathematics) of students is assessed by examining the year to year growth of these participants. Since students were tested for the first time during the spring of 1980, it is not possible to report findings this year regarding the impact of Project Concern on the basic skill growth of participating students.

In addition to the Metropolitan Achievement Test, a Student Survey is administered to Project Concern students at grades 2-8 to assess their level of self-concept and attitude toward school. A review of the Student Survey responses obtained during the spring of 1980 indicates that the self-concept and school attitudes of Project Concern students in the areas of school and school work, classroom participation, and teachers are quite positive. This finding is consistent with the results of past evaluations of the Hartford Project Concern Program.

APPENDICES

FOLLOW-UP OF GRADUATES

Student Name _____ Address _____

Phone (Student or Parent) _____ _____

School Attended _____

Year Graduated _____ Marital Status _____ Number of Children _____

Career Information

1. When you were in high school, what type of job or career did you want to have after high school?

   _____

2. Are you now taking training for, or employed in the career you wanted to follow at the time you left high school?
   (Check one) Yes _____ No _____

3. Since leaving high school, have you held any job(s)? (Check one) Yes _____ No _____
   If yes, please provide the information below for the job(s) you have held since leaving high school.

Type of Job*	Full Time OR Part Time (Check One)		Did you like this Job? (Check One)	
			YES	NO
_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____	_____	_____

*This includes Military Service

4. How do you like your present job? (If unemployed, answer with respect to your last job.)
   (Circle one)
   a. Like it very much.
   b. Like it fairly well.
   c. Do not like it.
   d. Never had a full-time job.

5. What type of job or career would you like to have five years from now? _____

   _____

6. How long were you out of high school before you got your first full-time job? (If you have never had a full-time job, leave blank.)

7. What effect did your high school education have on the jobs you have held since graduating from high school? (Circle one)
   a. No effect at all.
   b. Helped me to get the job I wanted.
   c. Have never had a full-time job.

8. What has been the main difficulty you have experienced in your present job? (If unemployed, answer with respect to your last job.) (Circle one)
   a. No particular difficulty
   b. My schooling did not prepare me well enough to do the job.
   c. Conflicts with supervisors
   d. Have never had a full-time job.
   e. Other (Please explain) _____

Post High School Education

9. Have you attended any schools or colleges since graduating from high school? YES ____ NO ____

   If YES, please provide the following information regarding the schools or colleges you attended.

Name of School or College	Number of Years Attended	Major Areas You Studied	Full Time (check one)	OR	Part Time (check one)	Did You Graduate? YES (check one)	NO (check one)	If You Did Not Graduate, When Do You Expect to Graduate? Month	Year
_____	_____	_____	___		___	___	___	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____	___		___	___	___	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____	___		___	___	___	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____	___		___	___	___	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____	___		___	___	___	_____	_____

Survey filled out by: _____ Date _____

Appendix B

Examples of Various Occupations from the North-Hatte Occupational Prestige Scale and Their Relative Ranking from 1 to 10.

---

1. Physician (Medical Doctor)
   Scientist
   College Professor

2. Architect
   Dentist
   Minister

3. Lawyer
   Chemical Engineer
   Airline Pilot

4. Accountant
   Public School Teacher
   Biologist

5. Registered Nurse
   Fashion Designer
   Electrician

6. Insurance Agent
   Bookkeeper
   Undertaker

7. Auto Mechanic
   Policeman
   Clerk Typist

8. Clerk in a Store
   Truck Driver
   Factory Machine Operator

9. Filling Station Attendent
   Coal Miner
   Restaurant Waiter

10. Shoe Shiner
    Janitor
    Trash Collector

Appendix C

Examples of the Three Types of Career Patterns

Type	High School Career Choice	Career Choice Five Years From Now	Work History	Post-High School Education or Vocational Training
Consistent				
Example 1	Accountant	Accountant	2 Unrelated Jobs	Attending College in Accounting
2	Culinary Arts	Management in Culinary Arts	1 Related Job	Attending Culinary School
Inconsistent				
Example 1	No Choice	No Choice	2 Unrelated Jobs	None
2	Fashion Design	Fashion Design	2 Unrelated Jobs	Attending College in Early Childhood Education
Mixed				
Example 1	Military	Law Inforcement Officer	No Jobs	Attending College in Business Administration
2	Secretary	Computer Programmer	1 related job to high school choice	None

Appendix D

PROJECT CONCERN
STUDENT ATTRITION FORM

Student Name_____ Total Time in Program_____

Present Grade_____ Sex M F – Date_____

Address_____

School Departed From_____ Town_____

- -

Please check(√) options which apply and fill in necessary information so that the students current status and reason for leaving Project Concern are clear.

I. CHANGE OF ADDRESS

Please check appropriate option below and provide comment(s) when necessary.

(a) Out of State _____

(b) Out of City _____

(c) Out of Project Concern District _____

(d) Other (Please explain)_____

_____

_____

New Address_____

_____

II. TRANSFER TO ANOTHER SCHOOL

1. Hartford Public Schools

Name of School_____

Please check appropriate reason(s) below and provide comments when necessary.

(a) Recommended for Special Education _____

(b) Recommended for Special Academic Program _____

(c) Disciplinary _____

(d) Social (Student desires to attend school and related social or athletic activities with friends in Hartford). _____

Please comment if applicable_____

_____

(e) Part-Time Employment in Hartford _____

e-1. Transportation Problem _____

e-2. Scheduling Problem _____

e-3. Both of the Above Reasons _____

(e) Part Time Employment in Hartford (continued)

e-4. Other (Please Comment)_____

_____

(f) Medical _____

(g) Parent Home Need (e.g., Baby Sitting) _____

(h) Other (Please Comment)_____

_____

2. Private School

Name of School_____

Please check appropriate reason(s) below and provide comments when necessary.

(a) Parents Feel Alternative Setting is Needed _____

(b) Parents Feel Chances of Getting into

College Higher at Private School, _____

(c) Other (Please Comment)_____

_____

3. Technical School

Name of School_____

Please check appropriate reason(s) below and provide comments when necessary.

(a) Suburban School has Limited Technical Curriculum _____

(b) Other (Please Comment)_____

_____

III. "NO SHOWS"

(a) Enrolled During the Summer but Never Entered the Program _____

(b) Other (Please Comment)_____

_____

IV. PREGNANCY

Curent Placement_____

V. CORRECTIONAL INSTITUTION

Name of Institution_____

VI. OTHER REASONS (Please Comment)_____

_____

Prepared By_____ Date_____

DWIGHT DIAGNOSTIC CENTER

1. Name:
   Grade: 2
   Address:
   Departed From:
   Placed At: Waverly
   Date: 1/8/80

   Recommended full-time Learning Disability Program.

   Placement: I.E.P. could not be implemented because school was unable, despite numerous attempts, to get parent signature. Placement in full-time program scheduled for 9/80.

2. Name:
   Grade: 5
   Address:
   Departed From:
   Placed at: Clark
   Date: 9/18/79

   Recommended regular 5th grade program with EMR Resource Room help.
   PLACEMENT: I.E.P. cannot be implemented because school has been unable to get parent signature.

3. Name:
   Grade: 4
   Address:
   Departed From:
   Placed At: Wish
   Date: 9/5/79

   Recommended full-time Learning Disability Program.

   PLACEMENT: Parent refused placement of student at Wish School where program was housed. Programs located at other sites were filled. Placement in full-time program at another site will be available for 9/80.

4. Name:
   Grade: 1
   Address:
   Departed From:
   Placed At: Dwight
   Date: 1/28/80

   Recommended placement in a Language Disability Resource Room.

   PLACEMENT: School PAT recommended same program. Student placed.

5. Name:
Grade: 1
Address:
Departed From:
Placed At: West Middle
Date: 9/17/79

Recommended full-time program where curriculum is geared to remediating visual and auditory perceptual deficits. Involvement with school Social Worker.

PLACEMENT: School did not agree with Diagnostic Center report. Placed student in regular program where he made a very good adjustment. Student moved to Bloomfield 3/80.

DIRECT PLACEMENT

6. Name:
Grade: 5
Address:
Departed From:
Placed At: Sand
Date: 11/21/79

Placed in Self-Contained Learning Disability program.

7. Name:
Grade: 7
Address:
Departed From:
Placed At: Fox Middle
Date: 2/4/80

Placed in Intensive L.D. Program 2-3 periods per day.

8. Name:
Grade: 1
Address:
Departed From:
Placed At: J. C. Clark
Date: 11/29/79

Receiving Speeh only.

9. Name:
Grade: 5
Address:
Departed From:
Placed At: Fox Elementary
Date: 3/18/80

Placed in full-time program for emotionally disturbed students.

10. Name:
Grade: 6
Address:
Departed From:
Placed at: Dwight School
Date: 1/2/80

Placed in full-time Learning Disability program.

11. Name:
Grade: 7
Address:
Departed From:
Placed At: Fox Middle
Date: 10/10/79

Placed in Intensive L.D. program at Fox Middle School receiving 12.5 hours per week of service.

12. Name:
Grade: 10
Address:
Departed From:
Placed At: Fox Middle
Date: 3/3/80

Placed in full-time EMR program at Fox Middle.

13. Name:
Grade: 4
Address:
Departed From:
Placed At: Dwight
Date: 2.25.80

APPENDIX F

Connecticut State Department of Education

1979-1980 Compensatory Project Evaluation Reporting Form

for the

Hartford Project Concern Program

1979-80 COMPENSATORY PROJECT EVALUATION REPORTING FORM

PLEASE SUBMIT
TWO COPIES

THIS REPORT IS DUE 6/20/80

C.S.D.E.
State Office Bldg., Rm. 375
P.O. Box 2219
Hartford, Connecticut 06115

School District: Hartford Public Schools

District Address: 249 High Street, Hartford, CT. 06103 (1-3)

Project Title: Project Concern

Director: William Paradis (Name) 527-5240 (Telephone) (5-6)

Evaluator: Robert J. Nearine (Name) 566-6074 (Telephone)

(8-9)

Program Site(s): See attached list

(11-12)

Funds supporting this component:

Title I:	1,009,296	(14-20)
SADC public:	279,490	(22-27)
SADC non-public:		(29-34)
Other (specify): PA611	381,830	(36-42)
TOTAL:	1,670,616	

Expenditures included in Total above which supported services to private school children: 114,659 (44-49)/

Unduplicated count of program participants by grade levels:

PUBLIC SCHOOL

PK	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	TOTALS
(8-10)	(12-14)	92 (16-18)	100 (20-22)	117 (24-26)	138 (28-30)	156 (32-34)	157 (36-38)	151 (40-42)	122 (44-46)	133 (48-50)	109 (52-54)	66 (56-58)	64 (60-62)/	1,405

PRIVATE SCHOOL

PK	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	TOTALS
X	(12-14)	6 (16-18)	7 (20-22)	7 (24-26)	8 (28-30)	6 (32-34)	16 (36-38)	12 (40-42)	17 (44-46)	3 (48-50)	(52-54)	(56-58)	(60-62)/	82

Number and full-time equivalent of project staff paid by compensatory funds:

	Instructional No.	Instructional f.t.e.	Other Professional (Specify)	Other Professional No.	Other Professional f.t.e.	Clerical or Other (Specify)	Clerical or Other No.	Clerical or Other f.t.e.
Teachers	10 (8-9)	9.5 (11-15)	Administrator	1	1	Sec./Clerical	3	3
Aides	53 (18-19)	53 (21-25)				Coordinator of Aides	1	1
				((28-29)	.) (31-35)		((38-39)	) (41-45)

79

80

School District Hartford Public Schools Component Title Project Concern Page 2 a

Using this page, (1) State the performance objectives for this component (from the Application); (2) Specify the measure(s) used to evaluate each objective; (3) Indicate the method of analysis applied to the data collected with each instrument; (4) Present the results of the evaluation. At the foot of the page state one or more program recommendations based on the evaluation findings.

PERFORMANCE OBJECTIVES	DATES INSTRUMENTS/ADMINISTERED	TREATMENT OF DATA INCLUDING TESTS FOR SIGNIFICANCE	RESULTS
Pupils will show month for month gains on an average by grade in Language Development.	Metropolitan Achievement Tests were administered during the period of early April to early June 1980 at grade 2-8.	Since this is the first year of implementing and evaluation design using spring to spring testing, this information cannot be provided.	

RECOMMENDATIONS: Program staff are presently reviewing evaluation results and will be formulating recommendations.

School District Hartford Public Schools Component Title Project Concern Page 2 b

Using this page, (1) State the performance objectives for this component (from the Application); (2) Specify the measure(s) used to evaluate each objective; (3) Indicate the method of analysis applied to the data collected with each instrument; (4) Present the results of the evaluation. At the foot of the page state one or more program recommendations based on the evaluation findings.

PERFORMANCE OBJECTIVES	DATES INSTRUMENTS/ADMINISTERED	TREATMENT OF DATA INCLUDING TESTS FOR SIGNIFICANCE	RESULTS
Pupils will show month for month gains on an average by grade in Math.	Metropolitan Achievement Tests were administered during the period of early April to early June 1980 at grade 2-8.	Since this is the evaluation design information cannot be provided.	first year of implementing and using spring to spring testing, this

RECOMMENDATIONS: Program staff are presently reviewing evaluation results and will be formulating recommendations.

School District Hartford Public Schools Component Title Project Concern Page 2 c

Using this page, (1) State the performance objectives for this component (from the Application); (2) Specify the measure(s) used to evaluate each objective; (3) Indicate the method of analysis applied to the data collected with each instrument; (4) Present the results of the evaluation. At the foot of the page state one or more program recommendations based on the evaluation findings.

PERFORMANCE OBJECTIVES	DATES INSTRUMENTS/ADMINISTERED	TREATMENT OF DATA INCLUDING TESTS FOR SIGNIFICANCE	RESULTS
Pupils will show a positive self-concept and attitude toward school at the end of a year's participation in the program.	A ten item self-concept and attitude toward school scale was adopted from the Instructional Objectives Exchange nationally normed item pool. This scale was administered to students at grades 2 through 8 at the same time as the Metropolitan Achievement Tests.	A descriptive summary was prepared of student item responses by grade level.	Students at grades 2 through 8 exhibited positive affective dispositions on all items. By grouping items into categories it was concluded that students held positive attitudes as they relate to their teachers, class participation, as well as school and school work.

RECOMMENDATIONS: Program staff are presently reviewing evaluation results and will be formulating recommendations.

School District Hartford Public Schools (1-3) Component Title Project Concern - Suburban (4-8)

FOR BASIC SKILLS PROJECTS WHICH SERVED PUPILS AT OR ABOVE GRADE TWO, USE THIS PAGE

(9) 1. INSTRUCTIONAL SERVICE (Check One) [] READING [] LANGUAGE ARTS [] MATH

(10) 2. TYPE OF NORMS USED IN SCORE CONVERSIONS [X] NATIONAL [] OTHER (Specify)

(11) 3. WAS THE PRETEST INSTRUMENT USED TO SELECT PROGRAM PARTICIPANTS? [X] NO [] YES → (see instructions)

4. TESTING PATTERN (12)
- [] Fall to Spring
- [X] Spring to Spring
- [] Fall to Fall
- [] More than 12 months

Column A	Column B	Column C	TEST INFORMATION							
Grade Level	No. of Pupils Who Received Instructional Services	No. of Pupils Pre/Post-tested	Name of Test	Edition (year)	Name of Subtest	Pre/Post Battery Level	Pre/Post Form	Month of Pre/Post Tests	Pre Test $\bar{X}$ S.S.	Post Test $\bar{X}$ S.S.
2		70	MAT	1970	Total Reading	Prim II	F	May	55	
3		84	MAT	1970	"	Elem	F	May	62	
4		81	MAT	1970	"	Elem	F	May	67	
5		101	MAT	1970	"	Int	F	May	73	
6		101	MAT	1970	"	Int	F	May	78	
7		103	MAT	1970	"	Adv	F	May	83	
8		62	MAT	1970	"	Adv	F	May	86	
(13-14)	(15-16)	(17-18)								
87	Total	602 Total Pre/								

Continued->

71

88

School District Hartford Public Schools (1-3) Component Title Project Concern - Suburban (4-8)

FOR BASIC SKILLS PROJECTS WHICH SERVED PUPILS AT OR ABOVE GRADE TWO, USE THIS PAGE

1. INSTRUCTIONAL SERVICE (Check One) [ ] READING [ ] LANGUAGE ARTS [ ] MATH
2. TYPE OF NORMS USED IN SCORE CONVERSIONS [■] NATIONAL [ ] OTHER (Specify) (9)
3. WAS THE PRETEST INSTRUMENT USED TO SELECT PROGRAM PARTICIPANTS? [■] NO [ ] YES → (see instructions) (10)
4. TESTING PATTERN (12)
   - [ ] Fall to Spring
   - [■] Spring to Spring
   - [ ] Fall to Fall
   - [ ] More than 12 months

(11)

Column A	Column B	Column C	TEST INFORMATION							
Grade Level	No. of Pupils Who Received Instructional Services	No. of Pupils Pre/Post-tested	Name of Test	Edition (year)	Name of Subtest	Pre/Post Battery Level	Pre/Post Form	Month of Pre/Post Tests	Pre Test $\bar{X}$ S.S.	Post Test $\bar{X}$ S.S.
2			MAT	1970		Prim II	F	May		
3			MAT	1970		Elem	F	May		
4		81	MAT	1970	Language	Elem	F	May	74	
5		101	MAT	1970	"	Int	F	May	80	
6		101	MAT	1970	"	Int	F	May	83	
7		103	MAT	1970	"	Adv	F	May	88	
8		62	MAT	1970	"	Adv	F	May	90	

Continued→

(13-14) (15-16) Total (17-18) 148 Total Pre/

72

89

90

School District Hartford Public Schools (1-3) Component Title Project Concern - Suburban (4-8)

FOR BASIC SKILLS PROJECTS WHICH SERVED PUPILS AT OR ABOVE GRADE TWO, USE THIS PAGE

(9) 1. INSTRUCTIONAL SERVICE (Check One) [] READI. G [] LANGUAGE ARTS [] MATH

(10) 2. TYPE OF NORMS USED IN SCORE CONVERSIONS [■] NATIONAL [] OTHER (Specify)

(11) 3. WAS THE PRETEST INSTRUMENT USED TO SELECT PROGRAM PARTICIPANTS? [■] NO [] YES → (see instructions)

4. TESTING PATTERN (12)
- [] Fall to Spring
- [■] Spring to Spring
- [] Fall to Fall
- [] More than 12 months

Column A	Column B	Column C	TEST INFORMATION							
Grade Level	No. of Pupils Who Received Instructional Services	No. of Pupils Pre/Post-tested	Name of Test	Edition (year)	Name of Subtest	Pre/Post Battery Level	Pre/Post Form	Month of Pre/Post Tests	Pre Test $\bar{X}$ S.S.	Post Test $\bar{X}$ S.S.
2			MAT	1970		Prim II	F	May		
3			MAT	1970		Elem	F	May		
4		81	MAT	1970	Total Math	Elem	F	May	78	
5		101	MAT	1970	"	Int	F	May	83	
6		101	MAT	1970	"	Int	F	May	88	
7		103	MAT	1970	"	Adv	F	May	95	
8		62	MAT	1970	"	Adv	F	May	99	

Continued

73

91 (13-14) (15-16) Total (17-18) 448 Total Pre/

92

School District Hartford Public Schools Component Title Project Concern - Non-Public

(1-3) (4-8)

FOR BASIC SKILLS PROJECTS WHICH SERVED PUPILS AT OR ABOVE GRADE TWO, USE THIS PAGE

1. INSTRUCTIONAL SERVICE (Check One) [] READING [] LANGUAGE ARTS [] MATH (9)

2. TYPE OF NORMS USED IN SCORE CONVERSIONS ■ NATIONAL [] OTHER _____ (Specify) (10)

3. WAS THE PRETEST INSTRUMENT USED TO SELECT PROGRAM PARTICIPANTS? ■ NO [] YES → (see instructions) (11)

4. TESTING PATTERN (12)
[] Fall to Spring
■ Spring to Spring
[] Fall to Fall
[] More than 12 months

Column A	Column B	Column C	TEST INFORMATION							
Grade Level	No. of Pupils Who Received Instructional Services	No. of Pupils Pre/Post-tested	Name of Test	Edition (year)	Name of Subtest	Pre/Post Battery Level	Pre/Post Form	Month of Pre/Post Tests	Pre Test $\bar{X}$ S.S.	Post Test $\bar{X}$ S.S.
2		6	MAT	1970	Total Reading	Prim II	F	May	64	
3		7	MAT	1970	"	Elem	F	May	67	
4		7	MAT	1970	"	Elem	F	May	73	
5		6	MAT	1970	"	Int	F	May	84	
6		16	MAT	1970	"	Int	F	May	83	
7		11	MAT	1970	"	Adv	F	May	85	
8		16	MAT	1970	"	Adv	F	May	99	
(13-14)	(15-16)	(17-18)								
	Total	69 Total Pre/								

Continued→

74

94

02

School District Hartford Public Schools (1-3) Component Title Project Concern - Non-Public (4-8)

FOR BASIC SKILLS PROJECTS WHICH SERVED PUPILS AT OR ABOVE GRADE TWO, USE THIS PAGE

1. INSTRUCTIONAL SERVICE (Check One) [ ] READING [ ] LANGUAGE ARTS [ ] MATH (9)
2. TYPE OF NORMS USED IN SCORE CONVERSIONS [■] NATIONAL [ ] OTHER _____ (Specify) (10)
3. WAS THE PRETEST INSTRUMENT USED TO SELECT PROGRAM PARTICIPANTS? [■] NO [ ] YES → (see instructions) (11)
4. TESTING PATTERN (12)
   - [ ] Fall to Spring
   - [■] Spring to Spring
   - [ ] Fall to Fall
   - [ ] More than 12 months

Column A	Column B	Column C	TEST INFORMATION							
Grade Level	No. of Pupils Who Received Instructional Services	No. of Pupils Pre/Post-tested	Name of Test	Edition (year)	Name of Subtest	Pre/Post Battery Level	Pre/Post Form	Month of Pre/Post Tests	Pre Test $\bar{X}$ S.S.	Post Test $\bar{X}$ S.S.
2			MAT	1970		Prim II	F	May		
3			MAT	1970		Elem	F	May		
4		7	MAT	1970	Language	Elem	F	May	80	
5		6	MAT	1970	"	Int	F	May	89	
6		16	MAT	1970	"	Int	F	May	89	
7		11	MAT	1970	"	Adv	F	May	90	
8		16	MAT	1970	"	Adv	F	May	100	
(13-14)	(15-16)	(17-18)								
95	Total	56 Total Pre/								

Continued-

School District Hartford Public Schools (1-3) Component Title Project Concern - Non-Public (4-8)

FOR BASIC SKILLS PROJECTS WHICH SERVED PUPILS AT OR ABOVE GRADE TWO, USE THIS PAGE

(9) 1. INSTRUCTIONAL SERVICE (Check One) [] READING [] LANGUAGE ARTS [] MATH

(10) 2. TYPE OF NORMS USED IN SCORE CONVERSIONS [X] NATIONAL [] OTHER (Specify)

(11) 3. WAS THE PRETEST INSTRUMENT USED TO SELECT PROGRAM PARTICIPANTS? [X] NO [] YES → (see instructions)

4. TESTING PATTERN (12)
- [] Fall to Spring
- [X] Spring to Spring
- [] Fall to Fall
- [] More than 12 months

Column A	Column B	Column C	TEST INFORMATION							
Grade Level	No. of Pupils Who Received Instructional Services	No. of Pupils Pre/Post-tested	Name of Test	Edition (year)	Name of Subtest	Pre/Post Battery Level	Pre/Post Form	Month of Pre/Post Tests	Pre Test $\bar{X}$ S.S.	Post Test $\bar{X}$ S.S.
2			MAT	1970		Prim II	F	May		
3			MAT	1970		Elem	F	May		
4		7	MAT	1970	Total Math	Elem	F	May	85	
5		6	MAT	1970	"	Int	F	May	90	
6		16	MAT	1970	"	Int	F	May	90	
7		11	MAT	1970	"	Adv	F	May	95	
8		16	MAT	1970	"	Adv	F	May	106	

(13-14) (15-16) (17-18) 56 (Total Pupils)

Continued-

School District Hartford Public Schools (1-3) Component Title Project Concern - Inner City (4-8)

FOR BASIC SKILLS PROJECTS WHICH SERVED PUPILS AT OR ABOVE GRADE TWO, USE THIS PAGE

(9) 1. INSTRUCTIONAL SERVICE (Check One) [] READING [] LANGUAGE ARTS [] MATH

(10) 2. TYPE OF NORMS USED IN SCORE CONVERSIONS [■] NATIONAL [] OTHER _____ (Specify)

(11) 3. WAS THE PRETEST INSTRUMENT USED TO SELECT PROGRAM PARTICIPANTS? [■] NO [] YES → (see instructions)

4. TESTING PATTERN (12)
- [] Fall to Spring
- [■] Spring to Spring
- [] Fall to Fall
- [] More than 12 months

Column A	Column B	Column C	TEST INFORMATION							
Grade Level	No. of Pupils Who Received Instructional Services	No. of Pupils Pre/Post-tested	Name of Test	Edition (year)	Name of Subtest	Pre/Post Battery Level	Pre/Post Form	Month of Pre/Post Tests	Pre Test $\bar{X}$ S.S.	Post Test $\bar{X}$ S.S.
2		13	MAT	1970	Total Reading	Prim II	F	May	49	
3		13	MAT	1970	"	Elem	F	May	58	
4		36	MAT	1970	"	Elem	F	May	61	
5		40	MAT	1970	"	Int	F	May	68	
6		42	MAT	1970	"	Int	F	May	69	
7		39	MAT	1970	"	Adv	F	May	81	
8		39	MAT	1970	"	Adv	F	May	85	
(13-14)	(15-16)	(17-18)								
99	Total	222 Total Pre/								

Continued-

77

School District Hartford Public Schools (1-3) Component Title Project Concern - Inner City (4-8)

FOR BASIC SKILLS PROJECTS WHICH SERVED PUPILS AT OR ABOVE GRADE TWO, USE THIS PAGE

(9) 1. INSTRUCTIONAL SERVICE (Check One) [ ] READING [ ] LANGUAGE ARTS [ ] MATH

(10) 2. TYPE OF NORMS USED IN SCORE CONVERSIONS [■] NATIONAL [ ] OTHER (Specify)

(11) 3. WAS THE PRETEST INSTRUMENT USED TO SELECT PROGRAM PARTICIPANTS? [■] NO [ ] YES → (see instructions)

4. TESTING PATTERN (12)
- [ ] Fall to Spring
- [■] Spring to Spring
- [ ] Fall to Fall
- [ ] More than 12 months

Column A	Column B	Column C	TEST INFORMATION							
Grade Level	No. of Pupils Who Received Instructional Services	No. of Pupils Pre/Post-tested	Name of Test	Edition (year)	Name of Subtest	Pre/Post Battery Level	Pre/Post Form	Month of Pre/Post Tests	Pre Test $\bar{X}$ S.S.	Post Test $\bar{X}$ S.S.
2			MAT	1970		Prim II	F	May		
3			MAT	1970		Elem	F	May		
4		36	MAT	1970	Language	Elem	F	May	66	
5		40	MAT	1970	"	Int	F	May	74	
6		42	MAT	1970	"	Int	F	May	77	
7		39	MAT	1970	"	Adv	F	May	85	
8		39	MAT	1970	"	Adv	F	May	88	
(13-14)	(15-16)	(17-18)								
101	Total	196 Total Pre/								

Continued →

School District Hartford Public Schools (1-3) Component Title Project Concern - Inner City (4-8)

FOR BASIC SKILLS PROJECTS WHICH SERVED PUPILS AT OR ABOVE GRADE TWO, USE THIS PAGE

(9) 1. INSTRUCTIONAL SERVICE (Check One) [] READING [] LANGUAGE ARTS [] MATH

(10) 2. TYPE OF NORMS USED IN SCORE CONVERSIONS [■] NATIONAL [] OTHER _____ (Specify)

(11) 3. WAS THE PRETEST INSTRUMENT USED TO SELECT PROGRAM PARTICIPANTS? [■] NO [] YES → (see instructions)

4. TESTING PATTERN (12)
- [] Fall to Spring
- [■] Spring to Spring
- [] Fall to Fall
- [] More than 12 months

Column A	Column B	Column C	TEST INFORMATION							
Grade Level	No. of Pupils Who Received Instructional Services	No. of Pupils Pre/Post-tested	Name of Test	Edition (year)	Name of Subtest	Pre/Post Battery Level	Pre/Post Form	Month of Pre/Post Tests	Pre Test $\bar{X}$ S.S.	Post Test $\bar{X}$ S.S.
2			MAT	1970		Prim II	F	May		
3			MAT	1970		Elem	F	May		
4		36	MAT	1970	Total Math	Elem	F	May	73	
5		40	MAT	1970	"	Int	F	May	80	
6		42	MAT	1970	"	Int	F	May	82	
7		39	MAT	1970	"	Adv	F	May	92	
8		39	MAT	1970	"	Adv	F	May	98	
(13-14)	(15-16)	(17-18)								
	Total	196 Total Pre/								

Continued-

(continued from p. 4) FOR BASIC SKILLS PROJECTS WHICH SERVED PUPILS AT OR ABOVE GRADE TWO

Weighted mean project gain:

Total, Column G
÷ =
Total, Column C

(Check One)
- [x] Reading
- [ ] Language Art
- [ ] Mathematics

Column D		Column E		Column F	Column G	
Associated Percentiles		Associated N.C.E.s (or x N.C.E.)		N.C.E. Gain	Weighted N.C.E. Gain= (col. C x col. F)	CSDE USE ONLY
Pre	Post	Pre	Post			
62		56				
54		52				
40		45				
34		41				
32		40				
36		42				
30		39				
(19-20)		(21-22)			Total	(23-30)

80

105

106

School District Hartford Public Schools Component Title Project School Page

(continued from p. 4) FOR BASIC SKILLS PROJECTS WHICH SERVED PUPILS AT OR ABOVE GRADE TWO

Weighted mean project gain:

Total, Column G ÷ Total, Column C =

(Check One)
- [ ] Reading
- [X] Language Ar
- [ ] Mathematics

Column D		Column E		Column F	Column G	
Associated Percentiles		Associated N.C.E.s (or x N.C.E.)		N.C.E. Gain	Weighted N.C.E. Gain= (col. C x col. F)	CSDE USE ONLY
Pre	Post	Pre	Post			
38		44				
36		42				
32		40				
38		44				
36		42				
(19-20)		(21-22)			Total	(23-30)

81

107

108

School District Hartford Public Schools Component Title Project Concern - Suburban Page 5

(continued from p. 4) FOR BASIC SKILLS PROJECTS WHICH SERVED PUPILS AT OR ABOVE GRADE TWO

Weighted mean project gain:

Total, Column G ÷ Total, Column C = [ ]

(Check One)
- [ ] Reading
- [ ] Language Art
- [x] Mathematics

Column D		Column E		Column F	Column G	
Associated Percentiles		Associated N.C.E.s (or x N.C.E.)		N.C.E. Gain	Weighted N.C.E. Gain= (col. C x col. F)	CSDE USE ONLY
Pre	Post	Pre	Post			
38		44				
38		44				
30		39				
38		44				
32		40				
109		(19-20)	(21-22)		Total	(23-30)

82

110

School District Hartford Public Schools Component Title Project School - Non-Public Page 5

(continued from p. 4) FOR BASIC SKILLS PROJECTS WHICH SERVED PUPILS AT OR ABOVE GRADE TWO

Weighted mean project gain:

Total, Column G ÷ Total, Column C = [ ]

(Check One)
- [x] Reading
- [ ] Language Ar
- [ ] Mathematics

Column D		Column E		Column F	Column G	
Associated Percentiles		Associated N.C.E.s (or x N.C.E.)		N.C.E. Gain	Weighted N.C.E. Gain= (col. C x col. F)	CSDE USE ONLY
Pre	Post	Pre	Post			
86		73				
68		60				
56		53				
68		60				
46		48				
42		46				
62		56				
		(19-20)	(21-22)		Total	(23-30)

83

School District Hartford Public Schools Component Title Project School-Non-Public Page 5-E

(continued from p. 4) FOR BASIC SKILLS PROJECTS WHICH SERVED PUPILS AT OR ABOVE GRADE TWO

Weighted mean project gain:

Total, Column G ÷ Total, Column C =

(Check One)
- [ ] Reading
- [x] Language Art
- [ ] Mathematics

Column D: Associated Percentiles		Column E: Associated N.C.E.s (or x N.C.E.)		Column F: N.C.E. Gain	Column G: Weighted N.C.E. Gain (col. C x col. F)	CSDE USE ONLY
Pre	Post	Pre	Post			
58		54				
68		60				
52		51				
44		47				
58		54				
	(19-20)		(21-22)		Total	(23-30)

School District Hartford Public Schools Component Title Project Connect - Non-Public Page 5

(continued from p. 4) FOR BASIC SKILLS PROJECTS WHICH SERVED PUPILS AT OR ABOVE GRADE TWO

Weighted mean project gain:

Total, Column G ÷ Total, Column C =

(Check One)
- [ ] Reading
- [ ] Language Ar
- [X] Mathematics

Column D		Column E		Column F	Column G	
Associated Percentiles		Associated N.C.E.s (or x N.C.E.)		N.C.E. Gain	Weighted N.C.E. Gain= (col. C x col. F)	CSDE USE ONLY
Pre	Post	Pre	Post			
60		55				
62		56				
38		44				
38		44				
54		52				
		(19-20)	(21-22)		Total	(23-30)

School District Hartford Public Schools Component Title: Project School [illegible]

(continued from p. 4) FOR BASIC SKILLS PROJECTS WHICH SERVED PUPILS AT OR ABOVE GRADE TWO

Weighted mean project gain:

Total, Column G ÷ Total, Column C =

(Check One)
- [x] Reading
- [ ] Language Ar
- [ ] Mathematics

Column D: Associated Percentiles		Column E: Associated N.C.E.s (or x N.C.E.)		Column F: N.C.E. Gain	Column G: Weighted N.C.E. Gain= (col. C x col. F)	CSDE USE ONLY
Pre	Post	Pre	Post			
34		41				
40		45				
24		35				
20		32				
14		27				
30		39				
28		38				
		(19-20)	(21-22)		Total	(23-30)

School District Hartford Public Schools Component Title [illegible]

(continued from p. 4) FOR BASIC SKILLS PROJECTS WHICH SERVED PUPILS AT OR ABOVE GRADE TWO

Weighted mean project gain:

Total, Column G ÷ Total, Column C =

(Check One)
- [ ] Reading
- [x] Language Ar
- [ ] Mathematics

Column D		Column E		Column F	Column G	
Associated Percentiles		Associated N.C.E.s (or x N.C.E.)		N.C.E. Gain	Weighted N.C.E. Gain= (col. C x col. F)	CSDE USE ONLY
Pre	Post	Pre	Post			
22		34				
24		35				
18		31				
30		39				
28		38				
	(19-20)		(21-22)		Total	(23-30)

87

19

120

School District Hartford Public Schools Component Title [illegible] Page

(continued from p. 4) FOR BASIC SKILLS PROJECTS WHICH SERVED PUPILS AT OR ABOVE GRADE TWO

Weighted mean project gain:

Total, Column G ÷ Total, Column C =

(Check One)
- ☐ Reading
- ☐ Language Art
- ☒ Mathematics

Column D		Column E		Column F	Column G	
Associated Percentiles		Associated N.C.E.s (or x N.C.E.)		N.C.E. Gain	Weighted N.C.E. Gain= (col. C x col. F)	CSDE USE ONLY
Pre	Post	Pre	Post			
26		36				
26		36				
16		29				
30		39				
34		41				
		(19-20)	(21-22)		Total	(23-30)